UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,443	12/28/2001	Surendra Kumar Rajak	1330.1107	4421

			EXAMINER
21171 7590 12/02/2005			LE, DEBBIE M

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/028,443	RAJAK, SURENDRA KUMAR
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DEBBIE M. LE	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 September 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-3 and 5-21_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3 and 5-21_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/8/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Owens et al (US patent 6,529,915 B1).

As per claim 1, Owens discloses a method for use with an object model which stores in a database (Fig. 3, #103), the method comprising:

automatically extracting the data from the database by directly extracting the data from the object model using an object query language corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 2, lines 28-30, col. 12, lines 26-30).

automatically translating the extracted data to a non-object format (Fig. 13, col. 12, lines 26-30).

As per claim 2, Owens discloses a method for use with an object model which stores in a database (Fig. 3, # 103), the method comprising:

automatically extracting the data from the database by directly extracting the data from the object model using an object query language corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 2, lines 28-30, col. 12, lines 26-30); and

automatically building a non-object database from the extracted data (col. 3, lines 25-29).

As per claim 3, Owens teaches wherein the non-object database is a relational database (col. 3, lines 28-29).

As per claim 5, Owens wherein said automatically building builds the non-object database using a query language corresponding to the non-object database (Fig. 13, # 605-611, col. 9. lines 14-19) and which is different from the object query language corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 12, lines 51-52).

As per claim 6, Owens teaches wherein the non-object database is a relational database (col. 3, lines 28-29).

As per claim 7, Owens teaches wherein the non-object database is a relational database (col. 3, lines 28-29) and the query language corresponding to the non-object database is SQL (col. 12, lines 1-25).

Claims 19-21 are rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claims 1 and 2 arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Owens et al (US patent 6,529,915 B1) in view of Shen (US Patent 5,937,410).

As per claim 8, Owens teaches a method comprising:

Selecting object-oriented data in an object model by a user (col. 6, lines 6-33),

the selected data being stored in a database by the object model (Fig. 3, # 103);

automatically extracting the selected data from the database by directly

extracting the selected data from the object model using an object query language

corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 12, lines 26-30); and

automatically building tables for the extracted data in accordance with metadata

for the extracted data, the tables being tables for a target relational database (Fig. 13, #

605-611, col. 9. lines 14-19).

Owens does not explicitly teach automatically inserting the extracted data into

the tables using a query language corresponding to the tables and which is different

from the object query language. However, Shen teaches automatically inserting the

extracted data into the tables using a query language corresponding to the tables and

which is different from the object query language (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 18-20). Thus, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to automatically inserting the extracted data into the tables using a query language corresponding to the tables and which is different from the object query language as taught by Shen because it would provide users of Owens's system to enhancing the usefulness of the transformation with further design options, such as efficiency querying the data in a manner of joining more than one tables to obtain the data in order to meet the programmer requirements.

As per claim 9, Owens teaches automatically loading the tables with the inserted data into the target relational database (col. 9, lines 56-60).

As per claim 10, Owens teaches automatically generating queries in the object query language corresponding to the object model, for extracting the selected data (Fig. 13, # performing a query).

Claims 11, 13, 16, 17 are rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 8 arguments.

Claims 12, 14 have the same limitation as claim 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

Claims 15 have the same limitation as claim 10; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

As per claim 18, Owens teaches wherein the selection device is one of the group consisting of a graphical user interface and a control table (col. 6, lines 19-33).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFREY GAFFIN can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEBBIE M LE
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

Debbie Le

Nov. 24, 2005.